



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/674,489	11/09/2000	Yukio Mori	P107314-0001	9177
7590	11/18/2004		EXAMINER	
Arent Fox Kintner Plotkin & Kahn Suite 600 1050 Connecticut Avenue NW Washington, DC 20036-5339			AGGARWAL, YOGESH K	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2615	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/674,489	MORI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Yogesh K Aggarwal	2615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3/1,3/2,6/1,6/2 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 November 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/09/2004</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabata (US Patent # 6,411,326) in view of Suzuki (JP Patent # 10322684).

[Claim 1]

Tabata teaches a camera signal processor (figure 1, element 2) characterized by comprising motion detection means (figure 3, S2) for dividing an image picked up by imaging means into a plurality of motion detection areas (figure 4(e)), and detecting the motion of the image for each of the motion detection areas (col. 4 lines 56-65);

extracting means for extracting (figure 1, element 2), on the basis of the motion of the image for each of the motion detection areas (figure 4(e)) which has been detected by the motion detection means (figure 1, element 2), the motion detection area where an object making abnormal motion exists (col. 5 lines 15-32, figure 3, element S3, figures 6(a), 6(c), 6(e) disclose that an area with different motion vector or no motion vector is detected as an abnormal motion vector detection area or high attention area. The Examiner notes that the claim is broadly interpreted to read the motion vector having abnormal motion as one having different motion

vector or no motion vector). Tabata fails to teach image enlarging means for enlarging the image picked up by the imaging means, centered on the motion detection area where an object making abnormal motion exists which has been extracted by the extracting means and displaying the enlarged image on a display device. However Suzuki teaches that it is well known and used in the art to have an image enlarging means (figure 1: 7) for enlarging the image picked up by the imaging means (figure 1: 1), centered on the motion detection area where an object making abnormal motion exists which has been extracted by the extracting means (figure 1: 4) and displaying the enlarged image on a display device (Solution to the Abstract, lines 1-19).

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Tabata and Suzuki it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have a enlarging means for enlarging the image picked up by the imaging means, centered on the motion detection area where an object making abnormal motion exists which has been extracted by the extracting means and displaying the enlarged image on a display device. Doing so would allow displaying the enlarged image data by detecting an abnormal state of the data with conditions which are previously set for the respective image areas of an image and superimposing enlarged image data for enlarging and displaying as taught in Suzuki (Problem to be solved part of the Abstract).

[Claim 2]

Tabata teaches that extracting means extracts (figure 1, element 2), out of the motion detection areas (figure 4(e)), the motion detection area where the motion of the image which has been detected by the motion detection means (figure 1, element 2) coincides with an abnormal motion

pattern previously set as an area where an object making abnormal motion exists (col. 5 lines 15-32, figure 3, element S3, figures 6(a), 6(c), 6(e)).

[Claims 4 and 5]

These are method claims corresponding to apparatus claims 1 and 2 respectively. Therefore they has been analyzed and rejected based upon the functional steps of the apparatus claims 1 and 2.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 3/1, 3/2, 6/4, 6/5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

a) The prior art fails to suggest fairly group forming means for grouping, out of the motion detection areas where an object making abnormal motion exists which have been extracted by the extracting means, the areas where an object making abnormal motion exists such that the areas connected to each other form one group, center-of-gravity detecting means for extracting, out of groups formed by the group forming means, the group having the largest area, and finding the center of gravity of the extracted group, a scaling-up means for scaling up the image picked up by the imaging means, centered on the center of gravity found by the center-of-gravity detecting means, and displaying the scaled-up image on a display device.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

i. Nagamura (US Patent # 5754225) discloses a video camera system of the type

mentioned, while occurrence of an abnormal situation is detected by detecting motion of a photographic object imaged by the video camera, the motion of the photographic object is usually detected using a method wherein difference values at same addresses of an image of a current field and another image of a preceding field are calculated and converted into absolute values and then integrated over the entire field to discriminate whether or not some motion is involved (col. 1 lines 13-24).

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yogesh K Aggarwal whose telephone number is (703) 305-0346. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM-5:30PM.

Art Unit: 2615

8. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Christensen can be reached on (703) 308-9644. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

YKA

November 15, 2004



TUAN HO
PRIMARY EXAMINER